



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/208,105	11/25/1998	KAZUHISA SAKAMOTO	10233.81USW1	7685

7590

09/06/2002

CURTIS B. HAMRE
MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-2903

EXAMINER

NADAV, ORI

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 09/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/208,105

Applicant(s)

SAKAMOTO, KAZUHISA

Examiner

ori nadav

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi (5,981,981) in view of Akihiko et al. (JP 7-297414).

Takahashi teaches in figure 30 an IGBT semiconductor device comprising a substrate 1-3 having a region 2 irradiated, crystal defects 44 within the region irradiated, a light metal wiring layer 42 comprising aluminum under the substrate and having an opening under the region irradiated so that radiating rays passing to the region irradiated through the opening generate crystal defects only over the opening.

Takahashi does not teach radiating the rays from the top of the substrate.

Akihiko et al. teach in figure 1c a wiring layer 33 comprising aluminum over the substrate, and radiating rays to create crystal defects 31 within the region irradiated 32 radiated from the top of the substrate.

it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to radiate the rays from the top of the substrate in Takahashi's

Art Unit: 2811

device in order to simplify the processing steps by forming the device from the top surface of the substrate. Note that it is known in the art to radiate the rays from the top surface and from the bottom surface of the substrate.

Regarding the claimed limitation of a metal wiring layer, Takahashi and Akihiko et al. teach a metal layer comprising aluminum. An aluminum metal layer can be categorized as a wire. Therefore, prior art teaches a metal wiring layer, as claimed. The broad recitation of the claim does not require the metal wiring layer to be connected to any of the active regions of the device. Note further that office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. See, e.g., *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321 - 22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow . . .").

Regarding claim 10, the wiring layer of prior art has a thickness so as to restrict penetration of rays into the region irradiated.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Akihiko et al. teach in figures 1c an insulation layer 12 being formed above the region irradiated, the opening being on the insulating layer, and the metal wiring 33 covers part of the insulating layer.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Takahashi teach a radiated region being a positive-negative junction where a parasitic diode is generated..

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant argues that the metal wiring layer of Takahashi and Akihiko et al. is not a metal wiring layer, because it is used as a mask layer.

Takahashi and Akihiko et al. teach a metal layer comprising aluminum. An aluminum metal layer can be categorized as a wire. Therefore, prior art teaches a metal wiring layer, as claimed. The broad recitation of the claim does not require the metal wiring layer to be connected to any of the active regions of the device. Note further that office personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. See, e.g., *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321 - 22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow . .").

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2811


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Art Unit: 2811

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(703) 308-8138**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**


TOM THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Ori Nadav

September 3, 2002